the Collectors had decided to give larger remissions in the case of certain districts, will the Government now be pleased to revise their last order and grant remissions on a higher scale? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I am afraid I cannot answer that question now."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Is the matter under consideration, Sir? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Yes."

Proposals of the Collector of Salem for remission of land revenue.

* 641 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) what report the Collector of Salem district made in the matter of remission of land revenue; and

(*b*) whether a copy of the report will be placed on the table?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 630.

Police

Expenditure for bandobust in Nandyal and Atmakur in regard to procession before the mosque.

* 642 *Q.*—S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to place on the table of the House—

(*a*) the extra expenditure that the Government had to incur every time in 1933, for making bandobust in Nandyal and Atmakur in connexion with procession before the mosque; and

(*b*) the reports called for in 1933 regarding the acts of the police with regard to the Muslims of Nandyal?

A.—(*a*) The Government have no information but have called for it.

(*b*) The petition[a] received from certain Muslims of Nandyal in October 1933 is placed on the table of the House. As regards the allegations made therein, the District Magistrate has reported that—

(1) The allegation that the District Magistrate had been told that the Muslims intended to appeal against the order of the District Munsif is untrue.

(2) There was no indiscriminate arrest of persons. The total number of persons arrested was only seven of whom four were Muhammadans and three Hindus. Some had previous convictions and two others had been previously charged with assaulting constables on duty. The arrests were made

---

[a] Printed as Appendix V on page 555 infra.

5th February 1934]

under section 107 (3), Criminal Procedure Code, and the arrested persons were all released within 24 hours.

(3) The allegation that the Muhammadans were ill-treated, that the purdah of their females was dishonoured and that they were prevented from answering calls of nature because people had been placed on the tops of Muhammadan houses is entirely untrue. No Muhammadan, whether man or woman or child, was ill-treated or molested. The entire street was placed in charge of a Muhammadan Sub-Inspector of Police and the District Magistrate himself was present throughout the procession. Every care was taken to see that perfect discipline was maintained and nobody had any legitimate ground for complaint. With the exception of the seven persons who were arrested, no one was prevented from attending to his ordinary avocations and no Muhammadan was stopped from going to prayers. The procession was timed in consultation with the Taluk Magistrate who is a Muhammadan so as not to interfere either with the afternoon or evening prayers of the Muhammadans and the Taluk Magistrate himself was posted at the disputed mosque so that Muhammadans might have full interfere either with the afternoon or evening out at the end of prayers. As regards placing people on house tops, in view of past experience, it was found necessary to post look-outs to watch for Muhammadans collecting in by-lanes and open places and creating disturbances. Such look-outs were posted on the tops of nine houses along the principal streets and only two of them were Muhammadan houses. The owners of those two houses raised no objection to the posting of look-outs on the tops of their houses, and no inconvenience was caused to the inmates.

(4) The allegation that the Assistant Superintendent of Police rebuked the Muhammadan gentlemen who had gone to the District Superintendent of Police to make certain representations is also untrue. The Assistant Superintendent of Police merely translated to those gentlemen the reply of the District Superintendent of Police which was to the effect that those who behaved quietly had nothing to fear but that those who were out for mischief should be careful.

[5th February 1934

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" In view of the seriousness of the allegations that have been made, will the Government consider the advisability of instituting an independent enquiry, apart from what the Collector himself says? "

The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN :—" There is no necessity for any enquiry. Allegations have been made and they have been repudiated in the report of the District Magistrate, and all these allegations have been proved to be false."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" I find that the allegations have been made against the officers of the district. Any useful purpose cannot be served by merely calling for report from the same persons against whom the allegations are made. Will the Government therefore consider whether it is not advisable to institute an independent enquiry? "

The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN :—" I do not think any independent enquiry is necessary, Sir."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—BUSINESS DURING FEBRUARY AND MARCH SITTINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

* The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN :—" Mr. President, Sir, with your permission, may I mention for the information of the House that, besides the days fixed in connexion with the discussion of the Budget, the House is likely to meet for the transaction of official business on the 27th and 28th February and the 1st March, and also on the 8th and 9th March? "

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" May the House have some information as to what the nature of the business is that is likely to engage the House? "

* The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN :—" The Local Boards Bill, the Central Land Mortgage Banks Bill and the Tolls Bill."

III.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS IMPARTIBLE ESTATES ACT, 1904 (BILL No. 17 OF 1933)—A. V. BHANOJI RAO.

Clause 4.

Section 9.

The House then resumed discussion of the Bill to amend the Impartible Estates Act (Bill No. 17 of 1933). Consideration of the amendment [a] of Mr. Muniswami Nayudu to clause 4 (section 9) was continued.

---

[a] *Clause* 4.

Section 9.

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

For clause 4 of the Bill, *substitute* the following:—

" Nothing in this Act shall affect or prejudice the rights of the creditors or of the members of the family of the person from whom the estate is acquired by exchange or purchase."